



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/672,404	09/26/2003	Denny Jaeger	4336	9153

7590 09/17/2009
Harris Zimmerman
Law Offices of Harris Zimmerman
Suite 710
1330 Broadway
Oakland, CA 94612-2506

EXAMINER

DHINGRA, PAWANDEEP

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2625

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

09/17/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/672,404	Applicant(s) JAEGER, DENNY	
	Examiner PAWANDEEP S. DHINGRA	Art Unit 2625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 June 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10, 14-28, 32-46 and 50-58 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10, 14-28, 32-46 and 50-58 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

- This action is responsive to the following communication: Amendment after non-final rejection filed on 6/12/2009.
- Claims 1-10, 14-28, 32-46 and 50-58 are pending.

Response to arguments

Applicant's amendments, filed 6/12/2009 have been entered and fully considered.

Applicant's arguments filed 6/12/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Winer and Dauerer fail to teach the limitation "*scrolling said geometric object with contents of said canvas object when a locking feature of said geometric object is activated in response to the surface of said canvas object being scrolled*" as recited in the independent claims.

In reply, examiner asserts that Winer teaches scrolling a geometric object with contents of said canvas object when a locking feature of said geometric object is activated in response to the surface of said canvas object being scrolled (see column 7, line 36-column 8, line 26, note that the objects can be moved via "once only" or "permanent" relationship schemes. Wherein when permanent is selected all the objects are moved together in unison as a group when one of the object is dragged, while when once only is selected then only the selected object moves when it is dragged, see also figs. 4-5).

Dauerer also teaches linking geometric object to a canvas object having a surface that may be partially viewable (see figures 4-5; column 4, line 63-column 5, line 23; column 1, lines 31-34); scrolling said geometric object with contents of said canvas object when a locking feature of said geometric object is activated in response to the surface of said canvas object being scrolled (see figures 4-5, 9-11; column 4, line 63-column 6, line 40; column 9, lines 58-65, note that when locking feature of display function is activated, the locked portions of display does not move or are displayed).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

Previous 101 rejections to claims have been withdrawn in view of applicant's amendments to claims.

Examiner Notes

Examiner cites particular paragraphs, columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims below for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested that, in preparing responses, the applicant fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 20, 37 and 56-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Abe et al., US 6,975,425 in view of Winer, US 5,796,401.

Re claim 1, Abe et al discloses a method for selectively printing graphic objects displayed on a display device (see column 1, lines 25-42), said method comprising: creating a geometric object, said geometric object defining an area of said display device to be printed on a selected print medium (see column 11, line 55-column 14, line 60; figures 8-10, 13-15, 22-23, 25); linking said geometric object to a canvas object having a surface that may be partially viewable (see figures 3, 13, 22-30, also see corresponding text in the specification); and converting said graphic objects within said geometric object to print driver data to print said graphic objects within said geometric object on said selected print medium (see column 11, line 55-column 14, line 60; figures 8-10, 13-15, 22-23, 25).

Winer teaches scrolling a geometric object with contents of said canvas object when a locking feature of said geometric object is activated in response to the surface of said canvas object being scrolled (see column 7, line 36-column 8, line 26, note that the objects can be moved via "once only" or "permanent" relationship schemes.

Art Unit: 2625

Wherein when permanent is selected all the objects are moved together in unison as a group when one of the object is dragged, while when once only is selected then only the selected object moves when it is dragged, see also figs. 4-5).

Therefore, it would have been advantageous to modify the information processing apparatus as disclosed by Abe to include the drawing objects techniques as taught by Winer for the benefit of facilitating the design of page layouts by a user as taught by Winer at column 1, lines 15-16. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to combine the apparatus of Abe with the apparatus of Winer to reach the aforementioned advantage.

Re claim 20, Abe discloses a graphical user interface for selectively printing graphic objects displayed on a display device (see figures 3, 11; see column 11, line 55-column 14, line 60), claim 20 is essentially similar to claim 1, except it is an apparatus claim, hence arguments made for claim 1 are applicable for claim 20.

Re Claim 37, claim 37 recites identical features, as claims 1, except claims 37 merely deals with executing the method of claim 1 on a computer. Thus, arguments made for claim 1 are applicable for claim 37.

Re claim 56, Abe et al discloses a method for selectively printing graphic objects displayed on a display device (see column 1, lines 25-42),, said method comprising: creating a geometric object, said geometric object defining an area of said display device to be printed on a selected print medium (see column 11, line 55-column 14, line 60; figures 8-10, 13-15, 22-23, 25); linking said geometric object to a canvas object having a surface that may be partially viewable (see figures 3, 13, 22-30, also see

Art Unit: 2625

corresponding text in the specification); and converting said graphic objects within said geometric object to print driver data to print said graphic objects within said geometric object on said selected print medium (see column 11, line 55-column 14, line 60; figures 8-10, 13-15, 22-23, 25).

Winer teaches scrolling contents of said canvas object without moving said geometric object when a locking feature of said geometric object is not activated in response to the surface of said canvas object being scrolled (see column 7, line 36-column 8, line 26, note that the objects can be moved via "once only" or "permanent" relationship schemes. Wherein when permanent is selected all the objects are moved together in unison as a group when one of the object is dragged, while when once only is selected then only the selected object moves when it is dragged, see also figs. 4-5).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to modify the information processing apparatus as disclosed by Abe to include the drawing objects techniques as taught by Winer for the benefit of facilitating the design of page layouts by a user as taught by Winer at column 1, lines 15-16.

Re claim 57, Abe discloses a graphical user interface for selectively printing graphic objects displayed on a display device (see figures 3, 11; see column 11, line 55-column 14, line 60), claim 57 is essentially similar to claim 56, except it is an apparatus claim, hence arguments made for claim 56 are applicable for claim 57.

Re Claim 58, claim 58 recites identical features, as claims 56, except claims 58 merely deals with executing the method of claim 56 on a computer. Thus, arguments made for claim 56 are applicable for claim 58.

3. Claims 1-10, 14-28, 32-46 and 50-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Abe et al., US 6,975,425 in view of Dauerer et al., US 5,841,435.

Re claim 1, Abe et al discloses a method for selectively printing graphic objects displayed on a display device (see column 1, lines 25-42), said method comprising: creating a geometric object, said geometric object defining an area of said display device to be printed on a selected print medium (see column 11, line 55-column 14, line 60; figures 8-10, 13-15, 22-23, 25); linking said geometric object to a canvas object having a surface that may be partially viewable (see figures 3, 13, 22-30, also see corresponding text in the specification); and converting said graphic objects within said geometric object to print driver data to print said graphic objects within said geometric object on said selected print medium (see column 11, line 55-column 14, line 60; figures 8-10, 13-15, 22-23, 25).

Dauerer teaches linking geometric object to a canvas object having a surface that may be partially viewable (see figures 4-5; column 4, line 63-column 5, line 23; column 1, lines 31-34); scrolling said geometric object with contents of said canvas object when a locking feature of said geometric object is activated in response to the surface of said canvas object being scrolled (see figures 4-5, 9-11; column 4, line 63-

Art Unit: 2625

column 6, line 40; column 9, lines 58-65, note that when locking feature of display function is activated, the locked portions of display does not move or are displayed).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to modify the information processing apparatus as disclosed by Abe to include the object manipulating techniques as taught by Dauerer for the benefit of “easily move any work onto or out of the desk pad or display without disturbing the rest of the work area” as taught by Dauerer at column 2, lines 30-33.

Re claim 2, In addition to elements disclosed related to claim 1 above, Abe further discloses wherein said converting includes converting a portion of a graphic object that is partially within said geometric object so that said portion of said graphic object is printed on said selected print medium (see figures 14-15; column 26, line 10-column 27, line 59).

Re claim 3, In addition to elements disclosed related to claim 1 above, Abe further discloses wherein said converting includes resealing said graphic objects within said geometric object such that said graphic objects within said geometric object when printed on a printable area of said selected print medium are in the same proportion to said printable area as said graphic objects displayed on said display device are to said geometric object (see column 26, line 10-column 27, line 59; column 28, lines 7-60; see figures 19, 25, 35, 42).

Re claim 4, In addition to elements disclosed related to claim 1 above, Abe further discloses changing a size of said geometric object without changing sizes of said

Art Unit: 2625

graphic objects within said geometric object to correspondingly change said sizes of said graphic objects within said geometric object when printed on said print medium (see figure 118-119; column 75, line 15-column 76, line 21).

Re claim 5, In addition to elements disclosed related to claim 4 above, Abe further discloses wherein said changing includes changing said size of said geometric object displayed on said display device to an actual printable area size of said print medium in response to a user activation of an actual size feature of said geometric object (see figures 62-64 with corresponding text).

Re claim 6, In addition to elements disclosed related to claim 4 above, Abe further discloses wherein said changing includes diagonally moving a cursor to select the size of said geometric object (see column 11, line 55-column 14, line 60).

Re claim 7, In addition to elements disclosed related to claim 1 above, Abe further discloses moving said geometric object on said display device to define a new corresponding area of said display device to be printed (see column 11, line 55-column 14, line 60).

Re claim 8, In addition to elements disclosed related to claim 1 above, Abe further discloses deleting said geometric object by moving a cursor from one corner of said geometric object to another corner of said geometric object (see column 11, line 55-column 14, line 60; figures 14-15).

Re claim 9, In addition to elements disclosed related to claim 1 above, Abe further discloses wherein said creating includes creating an array of geometric objects,

Art Unit: 2625

each of said geometric objects of said array representing a printable area of print media (see column 11, line 55-column 14, line 60).

Re claim 10, In addition to elements disclosed related to claim 1 above, Abe further discloses converting said geometric object into an array of geometric objects in response to a multiple page feature of said geometric object, each of said geometric objects of said array representing a printable area of print media (see figures 52-55; column 46, line 31-column 48, line 28).

Re claim 14, Abe further discloses wherein said creating includes creating an array of geometric objects on said surface of said canvas object, each of said geometric objects of said array representing a printable area of print media (see column 11, line 55-column 14, line 60; figures 62-64 with corresponding text).

Re claim 15, Abe further discloses converting said geometric object into an array of geometric objects on said surface of said canvas object, each of said geometric objects of said array representing a printable area of print media (see column 11, line 55-column 14, line 60; figures 62-64 with corresponding text).

Re claim 16, Abe further discloses changing sizes of said geometric objects of said array displayed on said display device without changing a size of any content in said canvas object (see figure 118-119; column 75, line 15-column 76, line 21).

Re claim 17, Abe further discloses wherein said changing includes changing said sizes of said geometric objects of said array displayed on said display device to actual

Art Unit: 2625

printable area sizes of print media in response to a user activation of an actual size feature of said array of geometric objects (see figures 62-64 with corresponding text).

Re claim 18, Abe further discloses changing a width size of said canvas object to equal a width size of said geometric object in response to a user activation of a snap to feature (see figure 25; column 33, line 50-column 34, line 22).

Re claim 19, Abe further discloses selecting some of said geometric objects of said array in an order to define a printing sequence for at least some of said geometric objects (see figures 62-64 with corresponding text).

Re claim 20, Abe discloses a graphical user interface for selectively printing graphic objects displayed on a display device (see figures 3, 11; see column 11, line 55-column 14, line 60), claim 20 is essentially similar to claim 1, except it is an apparatus claim, hence arguments made for claim 1 are applicable for claim 20.

Re claim 21, claim 21 recites identical features, and is essentially similar to claim 2. Thus, arguments made for claim 2 are applicable for claim 21.

Re claims 22-28 and 32-36, claims 22-28 and 32-36 recite identical features, and are essentially similar to claims 4-10 and 14-18, respectively. Thus, arguments made for claims 4-10 and 14-18 are applicable for claims 22-28 and 32-36.

Re Claims 37-46 and 50-55, claims 37-46 and 50-55 recite identical features, as claims 1-10 and 14-19, except claims 37-46 and 50-55 merely deal with executing the

Art Unit: 2625

method of claims 1-10 and 14-19 on a computer. Thus, arguments made for claim 1-10 and 14-19 are applicable for claims 37-46 and 50-55.

Re claim 56, Abe et al discloses a method for selectively printing graphic objects displayed on a display device (see column 1, lines 25-42), said method comprising: creating a geometric object, said geometric object defining an area of said display device to be printed on a selected print medium (see column 11, line 55-column 14, line 60; figures 8-10, 13-15, 22-23, 25); linking said geometric object to a canvas object having a surface that may be partially viewable (see figures 3, 13, 22-30, also see corresponding text in the specification); and converting said graphic objects within said geometric object to print driver data to print said graphic objects within said geometric object on said selected print medium (see column 11, line 55-column 14, line 60; figures 8-10, 13-15, 22-23, 25).

Dauerer teaches linking geometric object to a canvas object having a surface that may be partially viewable (see figures 4-5; column 4, line 63-column 5, line 23; column 1, lines 31-34); scrolling contents of said canvas object without moving said geometric object when a locking feature of said geometric object is not activated in response to the surface of said canvas object being scrolled (see figures 4-5, 9-11; column 4, line 63-column 6, line 40; column 9, lines 58-65, note that when locking feature of display function is activated, the locked portions of display does not move or are displayed).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to modify the information processing apparatus as disclosed by Abe

to include the object manipulating techniques as taught by Dauerer for the benefit of “easily move any work onto or out of the desk pad or display without disturbing the rest of the work area” as taught by Dauerer at column 2, lines 30-33.

Re claim 57, Abe discloses a graphical user interface for selectively printing graphic objects displayed on a display device (see figures 3, 11; see column 11, line 55-column 14, line 60), claim 57 is essentially similar to claim 56, except it is an apparatus claim, hence arguments made for claim 56 are applicable for claim 57.

Re Claim 58, claim 58 recites identical features, as claims 56, except claims 58 merely deals with executing the method of claim 56 on a computer. Thus, arguments made for claim 56 are applicable for claim 58.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to PAWANDEEP S. DHINGRA whose telephone number is (571)270-1231. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9:30-7:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David K. Moore can be reached on (571) 272-7437. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/P. D./
Examiner, Art Unit 2625

/Twyler L. Haskins/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625